																(G 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	}												•	
6	m —	П	9.7	9.2	9.0	8.8	8.3	8.1	7.2	6.8	6.8	8.9	6.7	6.3	6.2	5.5	5.5	5,5		5.2	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.2	3.9	3.5	3.4	ı	2
	0 4	97	_								1	Ī	<u> </u>	Ť	Ť	Ť		4	-	-		È	-	4		Ë	•		2.0	
	Moderate Weak	57				◁		O								0		4			0	7		4	Г	Γ	T	T	2.0	
Strong	声원	77				L					◁	L		L		$\prod$		•											0 Z	
St.	Moder	23		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	L	_				L						L			L					L	L			1.2	
		22		╀	L	L	Ļ	•	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ļ_	Ļ	<u> </u>	Ļ	_	$oxed{igspace}$	◁	_	L	L	7		◁	L	L		L	77	
WHATS	ž š	20	-	├-	Ļ	<u>_</u>	_	┼_	_	┞	_	-	╀	$\vdash$	10	-	┡	-	_	Ļ				ᅒ	•	_	_	_	2.6	
¥ >	VS. HOWs	61	╁	┼-	4	ᅒ	4	4	├	$\vdash$	0	├-	$\vdash$	├	┼	╀	4	_	_	V	V			$\vdash$	<u> </u>	┞	Ž	4	7.5	
		81	+	╁╌	$\vdash$	0		7	-	-		┝	┢	┝	╁	╁	7	ব	-	7	Н		_	$\vdash$	<del> </del>	4	<u> </u>		8.S 8.S	
. •		11	T	$\vdash$	•	Š	-	-			-	4		$\vdash$	╁	ব	4	1	H	-	Н			H		7	1	_	2.9	
		91		V	0			1		<u> </u>	1	Ť	Г	-	†	•	ব			Ø	ব	0		_		┢	-	<del></del>	0.E	
	200						V	◁			0	0					4		-	_	П		Ø	•	_		-		7'8	
	Ö	71	4	V				0		Ø	7		◁		4	4	4					Q				•			2.5	
		13	1	◁	0		7			4	L.		L	ļ.,		0	L		7		•		Δ						<b>3.</b> E	
		리	lacksquare	<u> </u>		V	ļ	0	4	•	_	_	_	Ø	_	ļ	4	_	◁	Щ					$\nabla$				8.E	
		11	┝	L		0	_		_	Ļ	_	_	L	ļ		L	_		_	Ц	_	◁	_		0	_	Ø		6.E	
		01	10		V	D	_	ᅒ	۷	◁	◁	_			<u> </u>	-	•		4		Ø	ᅱ	◁	Щ		_	-	_	9.E	
_	<b>1</b>	8	ব				0	7	Δ	7	4	-	0		0	┢	0	V	•	Ø	ব	왹		_		-	V	$\nabla$	1'7	
-1G. 20a		1	•				0	70	7	7	7	┝	0		_	-	Н	70	-	7	7		-	Q	_	Н		Н	E'7 6'7	
7	ı İ	9	<u> </u>		$\neg$	0	_	$\overline{}$	_	0	7	0	۲		_	4		7	0		7	ㅓ	$\dashv$	7	-		-	_	6'7	
_		5	0		ব	Ò	•	ব			V	Ť		<u> </u>	Н	Ť	ō	Q	Ť	4	ব	$\dashv$		-		V			5.2	
S		7		0	Ø						V			Ø	Г	0	V		∇	•		ব	히			Ö			9.2	
正	]	3	Ø				4	Ø	•	Ø			$\nabla$	V			0	7	0										6,2	
		7	0	•		◁	의	4	_	0	Ø		V	L	_	◁				4	00		_		⊴	O			C.T	
		1	ಠ	<u> </u>	의	4	۷	4	_		V	•	_	0	<u> </u>	0	Ц		◁	0	이	의	_	_	_	Ц			2.8	
			-	2,5	m	4	٦	9	-	∞	6	s 10	#	12	13	1,4	15	9	둓	8	5	2	5	22	23	77	25	26	_	7
				decisions 2		-						goals							desired results17											_
				cis				1		힑		je g							765	9			ڃ							Importance
				† de		S			릐	Ž		ans	ner						딜	all			sruption				<u>ĕ</u>			
Ŋ	<u>.</u>			best		유			e A	٩		zat	sto						Si	sis	ance		SC	- 1		-	ructive	- 1		<u>و</u>
es					- 1				9	<u>5</u>		ä	ä	ПS				ļ	e d	ē	5	ľ	Ö	23		ച	抗		- 1	
<del>.</del>	PRIORITIZI BY OPPORTUNI			핆		폥	- 1	ı	듄	를		2	TO .	护		_		- 1	티	ভ	es	- {	죔	ខ្ល	5	쁜.	self-dest		ŀ	Normalized
ž	BY BY TAP			틞	ŝ	히	ļ		占	Ĕ		ē	<u></u>	Š		.0		- 1	3	틸	늷	- [	<u> </u>	35	g	힣	ᆜ			<u> </u>
U.,	R P		i I	틝	빌	힐	- 1		目	S	- }	<u>.</u>	흥	=	(n)	닯		8	اڅ	힖	Ĕ	Ì	틹	Ē	9	5	Se		- 1	-
Ö	Ç		S		ស			_ [	듯	됩	ı	밁	٥	교	=	ô	,,	힐	ĕ	画	프	اير	ĘI	힏	#	뇕	인	ŀ	· j	<b>z</b>
S			ē	8	끈	-	- 1	6		:=		유	밌	SS	莒	먇	6	힐	픠	튄	=	9	ᆲ	힑	2	王	<u></u>		1	
a F	<u>^</u>	×	ţo.	픻	5	<u>آڇ</u>	일	둜	Ĕ١	B	ı	2	ا⊒.	5	-5	유	핑	힐	흳	Ē	ᇗ	ं	띪	희	울	의	2			}
0 5	# o E	`≓.	S	8		뜅	릚	إڄ	의	밀		읦	핡	2	뒤	S	2	中	급	된	뒨	잍	ËΙ	티	씨	N	S	욁	<b>.</b>	1
Δ Ξ		ZA	SC	씸	<b>:</b> ≣l.	اح	-1	: <u>:</u>	<u></u>	ا≝	띪	š		5	≌l	ye	4	2	리	3	3	١٣.	닯	S.	위	٣	:흥[	囙	٤	0.0
he	OESIRED OUTCOMES	¥ N	اڃٰا	≟ŀ	읈.	Z	9	<u>ا</u> څ	5	٤	đe	s f	5	딠	동	old	525	÷۱	뒮	ğ	듦:	≝ .	탉	ğ	<u> </u>	읭	티	틹	된	5 e
<b>⊢</b> ¾	MANAGEMENTS  DESIRED  OUTCOMES	ORGANIZATION	<u>ا</u> يد	희	틹	닒	12	۲ľ	넔	잀	팃	S	ef	S	2	E		의	اڃ	핃	ᇻ.	의	밁	ا م	돐		티	<u>.</u> []	اي	u gi
a) Z	E	0	칉	3	is i	إ	<u>.</u>	اچّا.	s	<u>ان</u>	20	띪	2	:=	=	ş	5	흴	핅	<u>a</u>	≝ .	욁	<u>.</u>	퇼	ᆱ	2	밁	Sel	듷	ole Ule
Ę			۲	75	<u>ا</u> ا	اق	9	ν.	E		ا≝	ま	io io	힐		a e	e l	7	딞	E I	티	<u>~</u>	E	2 0	5	9	<u>.</u>	=	ize	a ∈
Example - The Process Of Busines			Yel	1ZE	Ĕĺ	<u>ğ</u>		ž.	희:	)	의	DET	ZĮ.	뒨		₽	in a	Yey	2	힏	E	Ž	힑	la.	Ses	e >	밀	핅	핕	miz
ய		1	Deliver value to its customers	Vilize its collective knowledge to make the	Assume responsibility for its success	Compete effectively against other organizations	Minimize its risk of failure	Deliver value to its investors	Perform its actions in order of importance/value	Quickly transform its ideas into something of value	Control its own destiny	Cooperate across functions to achieve organizational	Minimize the effort required to obtain a customer	Coordinate its actions across all functions	Strengthen its skills and abilities	Motivate its employees to take action	Eliminate unnecessary actions	Deliver value to its stakeholders	Minimize the effort required to achieve the	Incorporate change with minimal internal resistance	Implement its plans without internal resist	Veliver value to its employees	Incorporate required change with minimal d	Operate with a focus on long term success	Possess the skills to achieve its goals	Motivate its employees to think creatively	Eliminate dependencies that are	Profect Itself from threats	Normalized Importance	Minimize value = 10.0 Maximum value = 0.0
		•			`اــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	:	للحب	1	٠	البت	لمنت						=1	=(		=1		<u>=1</u> :	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	=1		=1		<u>- 1</u>	<u> </u>

	1		Number of decisions made through organizational consensus
	2		Number of knowledgable employees involved in decision making
	3	->	Percent of required actions prioritized for synegistic value
	4	>	Percent of employees that are involved in decisions affecting themselves
•	5	->	Number of decisions that consider all the facts
	6	->	Percent of actions coordinated across all funtions
	7		Number of opportunities for customers to achieve their desired outcomes
	8	<	Number of actions taken that will not predict success
	9		Number of actions accomplished to establish a strength
	10	<	Number of actions that cannot be traced to the delivery of value
	11	->	Number of actions taken to grow a skill
			Time it takes to turn ideas into something of value
	13	->	Percent of employees that are committed to plans affecting themselves
203			Number of opportunities for creative thinking
(E)	15	->	Percent of long-term outcomes considered in decision making
			Percent of positive actions that are rewarded
			Number of failures linked to inadequate actions
			Number of defenses from threats/danger
			Number of plans that are out of phase with long term plans
			Number of actions that are externally motivated
			Percent of skills acquired to achieve the desired results
			Number of opportunities for investors to achieve their desired outcomes
			Number of known characteristics of the target customer
	_		Number of opportunities for stakeholders to achieve their desired outcomes
			Number of opportunities for employees to achieve desired outcomes
		۷-	Number of self-destructive dependencies
	1		Importance (Top 2 Box)
	2		Satisfaction With Current Approach (Top 2 Box)
	3		Maximum value = 12.0 Percent Importance
			Minimum value ≈ -1.0
	4		Percent Importance

									_					(0	3)													
	2	5.3	7.4	4.2	5.3	3,5	4.5	6.2	3.9	4.2	4.1	6.1	4.2	8.5	4.7	5.4	<u>5</u>	25	7,3	5.1	3.6	7.2	5.1	4.2	8.8	2.3	6.3	2
	3																											3
ļ	,			-	-	===												=	_	-							6	
Ĺ	4		2.2	4	6.	2.6	8.	.8	3.0	ü	ü	3.4	3. <u>£</u>	3,4	3.9	3.9	2	'n	iu	ŵ	5	_	5.2	5	6.6	3.8	. <u>.</u>	4
		26	25	24	23	22	21	20	3	8	=	5	ᅜ	7	٤J	72	=	8	9	œ	7	6	5	4	w	2	-	

FIG. 20b

			•	
Evaluation Criteria		υce	i	
CONCEPT SELECTION AND EVALUATION ANALYSIS		strogal	od Impon	0.1 = 30.
		Normalized	sv munixeM zilem no Normanizi	lsv muminiM
-> Percent of decisions made through organizational consensus	=	8.2		199
- A Percent of knowledgable employees involved in decision making	2	7.2		11:11
<ul> <li>Percent of required actions prioritized for synegistic value</li> </ul>	3	5.9		
-> Percent of employees that are involved in decisions affecting themselves	4	5.6	1	
-> Percent of decisions that consider all the facts	5	5.5		19:50
-> Percent of actions coordinated across all funtions	9	6.4	***************************************	I I I
-> Percent of uncovered opportunities for customers to achieve their DO's	1	6.4		1111
<- Percent of actions taken that will not predict success	8	4.3		E (1)
-> Percent of actions taken to establish a strength	6	4.1		<b>1</b> 111
<- Percent of actions that cannot be fraced to the delivery of value	10	3,9		<b>.</b>
-> Percent of actions taken to grow a skill	11	3.9		H
< Time it fakes to turn ideas into something of value	112	3.8		
<ul> <li>Percent of employees that are committed to plans affecting themselves</li> </ul>	[13]	3.6		1131
-> Number of opportunities for creative thinking	114	3.5		<b>5</b> 55
-> Percent of long-term outcomes considered in decision making	15	3.4		H 1
-> Percent of positive actions that are rewarded	16	3.0		
-> Number of failures linked to inadequate actions	17	2.9		1111
-> Number of defenses from threats/danger	48	2.8		
<- Percent of plans that are out of phase with long term plans	19	2.8		1989
<- Percent of actions that are externally motivated	20	2.7		<u> </u>
-> Percent of skills acquired to achieve the desired results	21	5.6		
-> Number of apportunities for investors to achieve their desired outcomes	22	7.7		11:11
-> Percent of known characteristics of the target customer	23	2.1	222	1818
-> Number of opportunities for stakeholders to achieve their desired outcomes 24	77	2.0		::::
	52	2.0	:-::=	1831
<- Number of self-destructive dependencies	56	2.0		ा ।

Evaluation Of Business Concepts

				<u>.</u>	747							
CONCEPT SELECTION AND EVALUATION ANALYSIS	L	$\vdash$				<u> </u>	$\perp$	-			Γ	
-> Percent of decisions made through organizational consensus	+	, 0	+	7 +	<u>i</u> +	9	ا ا ا	2 C 8				
	7 +	٠.	+		+	Ť	+-	7.2				
-> Percent of required actions prioritized for synegistic value	3 S	+	S	+	+		+	6				
Percent of employees that are involv	+	S	+	+	+	F	+ 5	5.6			Į::	
-> Percent of decisions that consider all the facts	5	S	S	+	+		+	5.5			<b>1</b>	
	9	+	+	+	+	<del>                                     </del>	7+	6.4			<b>.</b>	
- 1	7	S	S	+	+	<del>                                     </del>	+	6			<b>::</b> :::	
- 1	8	+	S	+	+		+	4,3	<u> </u>		<b>.</b>	
-> Percent of actions taken to establish a strength	+	+	S	+	+		+	-		<u> </u>	1	
Percent of actions that cannot be traced to the delivery of value	$\vdash$	+	S	+	+	Ť	+ 3.9	6				
> Percent of actions taken to grow a skill	11 5	+	S	+	+	Ť	+ +	6				
- 1		+	+	+	+	<del> </del>	+ 3.8	8			J	
-> Percent of employees that are committed to plans affecting themselves	13 5	5	+	+	+	Ť	+	3,6				
-> Number of appartunities for creative thinking	14 S	S	+	+	+	Ť	+ 3.5	5				
Percent of long-term outcomes considered in decision making	15 S	S	S	+	+	Ė	+ 3.4	7				
- 1	16 5	S	S	S	S	T	5 3.0	0				
	17 5	S	S	+	+	Ė	+ 2.9	6				
s/danger	18 S	S	S	+	+	Ė	+ 2.8	89				
Percent of plans that are out of phase with long term plans	19 S	S	S	+	+	Ė	+ 2.8	8				
Percent of actions that are externally motivated	20 5	S	S	S	S	$\vdash$	\$ 2.7	7		}:::: 		
Percent of skills acquired to achieve the desired results	21 5	S	S	S	S		S 2.6	9		-		
Number of apportunities for investors to achieve their desired outcomes	22 +	+	+	+	+	Ė	+ 2.4	4				
Percent of known characteristics of the target customer	23 +	S	S	+	+	<del>ا</del>	+ 2.1					
eholders to achieve their desired outcomes	24 S	1	+	+	+	<u> </u>	+ 2.0	0				
Number of apportunities for employees to achieve desired outcomes	25 S	1	+	+	+	Ė	+ 2.0	0				
f-destructive dependencies	26 5	S	S	+	S	Ė	+ 2.0	0			IIII	
Total Advantages	<b>6.</b> E€	r.EE	£.E4	916	9'68	700	916	Z				
Total Disadvantages	2	0.4					2					
Total Score	6,EE	1.62	E <sup>-</sup> E7	9.16	9.68	7 +0	9.16	[	FIG		22	O

Target Values For Prioritized Metrics MANAGEMENT'S REQUIREMENTS ON ITS ORGANIZATION

							ľ	
Т		ļ	7		٤	7	S	9
-> Percent of decisions made through organizational consensus	1	8.2	1000		%	95%	88%	866
-> Percent of knowledgable employees involved in decision making	2	7.2			15%	%09	95%	95%
> Percent of required actions prioritized for synegistic value	3	5.9			%	75%	%06	95%
> Percent of employees that are involved in decisions affecting themselves	4	5.6			15%	%09	95%	55%
-> Percent of decisions that consider all the facts	7.2	5.5			2%	+	88%	%66
-> Percent of actions coordinated across all funtions	2	6.4			20%	%06	95%	38%
Percent of uncovered opportunities for customers to achieve their DO's	7	6.4			25%	85%	%56	88%
	8	4.3			20%	10%	5%	2%
-> Percent of actions taken to establish a strength	6	4.1			25%	50%	75%	95%
<- Percent of actions that cannot be traced to the delivery of yalue	9	3.9			20%	20%	5%	2%
-> Percent of actions taken to grow a skill	=	3.9						
<- Time it takes to turn ideas into something of value	12	3.8						
—> Percent of employees that are committed to plans affecting themselves	m	3.6						
-> Number of opportunities for creative thinking	#	3.5						
	15	3.4						
-> Percent of positive actions that are rewarded	16	3.0						
-> Number of failures linked to inadequate actions	12	2.9						
> Number of defenses from threats/danger	8	2.8						
<- Percent of plans that are out of phase with long term plans	19	2.8						İ
<- Percent of actions that are externally motivated	20	2.7		1111				
-> Percent of skills acquired to achieve the desired results	21	2.6			1111			
-> Number of opportunities for investors to achieve their desired outcomes	22	2.4	-					
-> Percent of known characteristics of the target customer	23	2.1						
-> Number of opportunities for stakeholders to achieve their desired outcomes 24	77	5.0						
	25	2.0					_	
<- Number of self-destructive dependencies	26	2.0						

The Top 10 Metrics Synergistically satisfy 55% Of The Requirements

	1	QFD, 4 Phase vs. Typical Approach
	2	Process Reengineering vs. Typical Approach
	3	Teams vs. Typical Non-Team Approach
	4	Invention vs. Typical Approach
22a FIG	5	Invention vs. QFD
	6	
N	7	Ideal Theoretical Approach
22b	1	Normalized Importance
	2	Maximum value = 10.0 Normalized Importance
		·
		Minimum value = 1.0

1	Normalized Importance
2	Maximum value = 10.0
	Normalized Importance
	Minimum value = 0.0
3	Current Value of Most Organizations
	,
4	Target Value 1996
5	Target Value 1997
_	Taligat value 1771
6	Target Value 1999
	3 4 5

•

-